

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-15 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request that these amendments be entered, since the amendments reduce issues for appeal.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that claims 1-15 are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus nor do they transform a particular article into a different state or thing, thereby failing the machine-or-transformation test.

Applicants submit that the claims now recite a non-transitory storage device and are thus tied to a particular machine or apparatus.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the term “member” in the above claims is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended the claims of this application to delete the term “member” and replace this term with the term “device”. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the specification of this application sufficiently discloses such elements in a way as to reasonably convey that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants

regard as the invention. Specifically, Examiner states that the limitation reciting “makes reference to the storage member according to obtained order and combination of the medicine information” is not clear.

Applicants submit that this rejection appears to be an error, since this phrase was deleted from the claim in the previous response. As noted above, claim 1 no longer recites this language.

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the limitation “member” is unclear.

As stated above, the term member has been deleted and replaced with the term “device”. Therefore, Applicants submit that the claims are now clear, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-8 and 11-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuyama et al. (U.S. 7,333,938) in view of Kircher et al. (U.S. 6,975,924). Claims 2, 9, 10 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuyama in view of Walker et al. (U.S. 7,366,675).

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for the reasons set forth in the previous Response. Namely, the cited prior art fails to disclose a combination judging member that rearranges the medicine information according to medicine codes stored in the storage member when three or more medicines are included in the prescription information, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, and fails to disclose or render obvious that the hash value of the hash values calculated by the combination adequacy judging member corresponds to the one of the at least one hash value stored in the storage member, as recited in claim 2 of the present application.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyoyuki NAKATA et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2011.02.04 13:29:49 -05'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell

Registration No. 46,402

Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ete

Washington, D.C. 20005-1503

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

February 4, 2011